



Sigrid S. McCawley  
Telephone: 954-356-0011  
Email: [smccawley@bsfllp.com](mailto:smccawley@bsfllp.com)

June 11, 2025

**VIA ECF**

Honorable John P. Cronan  
United States District Court  
Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street, Room 1320  
New York, NY 1007

**Re: *Button et. al. v. Doherty et. al.*, Case No. 1:24-cv-05026 (JPC) (KHP)**

Dear Judge Cronan:

We represent Defendants Juliet Doherty and Krista King-Doherty (together, “the Dohertys”) in the above-captioned action. This case is one of several retaliatory lawsuits that Plaintiffs Dusty and Mitchell Taylor Button filed after Juliet Doherty and *six* other women sued them in the District of Nevada for sexual assault, sex trafficking, and related claims.

We write to provide the Court notice of two orders that provide further support for the Dohertys’ pending motion to dismiss. [ECF No. 43]. The first order, which is attached as Exhibit A, was entered on May 28, 2025, by the Honorable David S. Leibowitz, United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida. The second order, which is attached as Exhibit B, was entered on June 9, 2025 by Judge James V. Selna, United States District Court for the Central District of California. Both orders dismiss with prejudice defamation and related claims in other lawsuits brought by the Buttons.

In the May 28, 2025 order, Judge Leibowitz dismissed the Buttons’ defamation and related claims with prejudice because the allegedly defamatory statements reflected the defendant’s “subjective assessment of the merits’ of [the Nevada plaintiffs’] case” and were therefore inactionable opinion. [Ex. A at 7]. We respectfully submit that this reasoning supports our argument that here, the Buttons’ defamation claims likewise fail because the Dohertys’ alleged statements are inactionable opinion. [ECF No. 43 at 13–14].

In the June 9, 2025 order, Judge Selna dismissed the Buttons’ defamation and related claims with prejudice because their complaint violated Rule 8’s “short and plain” requirement and was instead “prolix and conclusory.” [Ex. B. at 6]. We respectfully submit that this reasoning supports our argument that here, the Buttons’ allegations likewise substitute rhetoric for substance and are impermissibly conclusory. [ECF No. 43 at 5–6, 9–11, 19–20, 23–24].

Respectfully,

/s/ Sigrid S. McCawley  
Sigrid S. McCawley

cc: All parties (via ECF)